





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/353,974	07/15/1999	VIKTORS BERSTIS	AT9-99-123 .	4395	
35525 759	90 · 10/22/2003		EXAMI	NER	
DUKE W. YE		SHAH, NILESH R			
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P. P.O. BOX 802334			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75380			2127	7	
			DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003	/ .	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			PU			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	11.			
Advisory Action	09/353,974	BERSTIS ET AL.				
•	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nilesh R Shah	2127				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 19 September 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this application appl	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the inan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date on FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe ite on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I 36(a) and the appropriat e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the			
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>						







Continuation of 10. Other: The arguments presented by applicants will be entered for purposes of appeal. Examiner has reviewed these arguments and believes that they fail to place the application in condition of allowance. Specifically, Applicant's main contention is that the Cuccia and Banga references are not combinable. However, as discussed in the Final Rejection, Banga teaches the use of a remotely located cache storage site. While this does not refer specifically to the encryption, Cuccia teaches the use of a browser supported encryption algorithm. The algorithm encrypts the web page before used by a user. Clearly, this is an object that is capable of being scoped by Banga and therefore the reference would be combinable.

Applicant further argues that the Schrader and Banga references are not combinable. However, as discussed in the Final Rejection, Banga teaches the use of a remotely located cache storage site. While this does not refer specifically to the applications, Schrader teaches different application specific information can be produced and encrypted. Clearly, this is an object that is capable of being scoped by Banga and therefore the reference would be combinable.

It is for these reasons and the reasons stated in the Final Rejection mailed on August 21, 2003 that the applicant's request for reconsideration had been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance.